

174/02403 A06

**REMARKS**

The present application includes claims 23-26, 30-43 and 45-86. Claim 86 is new. Claims 28-29 and 78 are cancelled herewith.

Claims 23, 32, 40, 45, 50, 55, 59, 70-72, 75, 77 and 80-84 are currently amended.

In the amendment, the computerized tools in claims 23, 32 and 77 were qualified as computerized design tools, using the words on page 1, line 15 of the application. Claim 23 was further amended to include providing a plurality of computerized tools, which each stores information restricted to viewing by a respective limited group of workers, assigned to a different system of the vehicle. This addition finds support at least on page 8, lines 7-20 together with page 9, lines 14-16. Claim 23 was also amended to add the requirement of opening the index for viewing by workers of all the groups of workers, which finds support throughout the application, for example on page 10, lines 16-19.

Claim 32 was additionally amended to require that each design tool stores sufficient information for carrying out a design task of a respective system. This requirement is inherent in the fact that the tools are design tools. A further amendment adds to claim 32 the limitation that the tools include "at least a hydraulic design tool and an electrical design tool", with support at least, on page 8, line 11. A further limitation states that the storing in the database includes only a subset of the hydraulic design information and the electronic design information. This amendment finds support throughout the application, for example in claim 11 and on page 3, lines 10-30.

The last clause of claim 32 was also amended, with support at least on page 19, lines 12-16 or page 14, line 26 and page 15, lines 3-6.

Claim 32 was also amended to include a limitation of opening the database for viewing by workers of a plurality of departments, assigned to different systems of the vehicle. This limitation finds support at least on page 10, lines 16-19.

In addition, the term discipline was added to the claim. The term has support in the application on page 18 and is explained with ample examples on page C-103 of the provisional application from which the present application claims priority.

Claim 45 was amended to add the limitation: "providing a working environment including a plurality of different departments, assigned to perform design tasks of respective different aircraft systems". This limitation finds support at least on page 8, lines 7-9. Claim 45 was additionally amended to replace "vehicle" by "aircraft", following the language of the preamble,

174/02403 A06

and to add the limitation of "identifying the major elements in a database using the assigned codes", which finds support at least on page 4, lines 24-31.

Claim 50 was amended in a manner similar to claim 45 and has the same support in the disclosure as filed. The term "aspect" was changed to "system", a term with sufficient support in the claim.

Claim 55 was amended for antecedent purposes and support can be found at least in the base claim. Claims 70, 71, 75 and 80 were amended as to style and self support the amendments.

Claims 72 and 82 were amended with limitations similar to those added to claims 32 and 45 and find similar support. In addition, claim 72 was amended to include "a reference to a worker in charge of the element", which was taken from claim 32.

Claim 77 was amended to include the statement: "each of the tools adapted for designing a different system of a vehicle by performing a plurality of design tasks", which finds support on page 8, lines 7-20.

New claim 86 includes, in addition to the limitations of the other claims, a statement on managing an action list, which finds support on page 15, lines 3-6, and acts which find support in Fig. 5.

#### **Telephonic interview**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview of June 21, 2006, between applicant's agents Yaakov Schatz and Maier Fenster, the Examiner Jason Proctor and the supervisor Paul Rodriguez. In this interview, the rejections in the office action were discussed, in an attempt to further the application toward allowance.

#### **Rejections for non-statutory material**

Claims 45-49, 78, 50-52, 72-74, 41-42 and 82-85 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as lacking a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. While the Examiner cited MPEP 2106(II)(A), applicant respectfully submits that it seems the Examiner has failed to follow its teachings. This passage clearly states that the claims must produce a useful, concrete and tangible result, in order to "limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research". None of the rejected claims is a mere idea or concept or simply a starting point.

Regarding the requirements of usefulness, applicant has explained in length in the application the usefulness of the methods of the invention which aid in designing vehicles.

174/02403 A06

Regarding tangibility, the guidelines of October 26, 2005, titled "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Subject Matter Eligibility", state that tangibility is the opposite of "abstract". None of the claimed methods is in any way abstract.

Nonetheless, in an attempt to satisfy the Examiner, applicant has amended the rejected independent claims in an attempt to further the prosecution of the present application.

Claim 45 was amended to require: "identifying the major elements in a database using the assigned codes". Claim 50, was amended to require "identifying the workers in a database using the assigned codes". Claim 72 was amended to include the limitation "displaying information relating to the one or more major elements and/or sending an electronic message to a worker in charge of the element based on information found in the search". A similar limitation was added to claim 82. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are directed to patentable subject matter.

#### **New matter rejections**

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for using the terms "public" and "private", which do not appear in the specification. In order to expedite prosecution, these terms were removed from the claim. If at all effecting the scope of the claim, this amendment broadens the claim.

#### **Clarity rejections**

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for various issues that the Examiner stated make the claim unclear. While applicant disagrees, the claim was amended in order to further the application toward allowance. These amendments include:

Removing the word private, which was considered unclear.

Explaining that the respective limited groups of workers, are groups assigned to different systems of the vehicle. Exemplary systems of the vehicle are described in the application in table 1 on page 17.

The term "aspect of the vehicle" was removed and replaced by systems.

The reference to departments was cancelled and replaced by reference to systems.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of these amendments the claim is clear and patentable.

Claims 28-29 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In order to expedite the prosecution, the claims were cancelled.

Claim 32 was rejected for using the term "suitable for performing design tasks". Applicant amended the claim to use the term "computerized design tools", which are well known in the art

174/02403 A06

and perform specific design tasks. The data required by these design tools in order to perform their tasks is well known in the art.

In addition, the statement "but serves as a directory for workers designing the vehicle", to which the Examiner objected, was removed.

The Examiner also objected to the use of the term "worker" in the claim, in stating that the term does not define the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is clear. If the Examiner has prior art describing the acts of claim 32 as being performed by a volunteer, the question that rises is of obviousness, not clarity.

The requirement of contacting a worker was replaced and further amendments were made in an attempt to satisfy the Examiner. Applicant submits that the claim now has none of the clarity problems raised by the Examiner.

Claim 40 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for using the term "relative function". In order to expedite the prosecution, the word "relative" was cancelled.

Claim 45 was rejected for being unclear. Applicant amended the claim to change "vehicle" to "aircraft". As to the use of the term "substantially all", applicant directs the Examiner to MPEP 2173.05(b)(F). The claim was further amended in an attempt to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 50 was amended to relate to systems rather than to aspects, and to use "generating" rather than "assigning".

Claim 55 was amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 59, 74 and 83 were discussed in the telephonic interview. Applicant's agents have stated that the elements are all the elements of the vehicle including rivets. Applicant, however, amended claims 59 and 83 to state that the percentages relate to the elements of the vehicle described by the design tools.

Claims 70 and 75 were rejected as being unclear. In response, the claims were amended to use the term "changing" instead of "changes".

Claims 71 and 80 were rejected as use claims. Although applicant disagrees with the rejection, the claims were amended to use different wording, which will not be similar to the wording of a use claim. In the telephone conversation it was apparently agreed that this would overcome the rejection.

Claim 72 was rejected for being unclear. The claim was amended to include a reference to a worker in charge of the element in the gathered information, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 77 and 81 were amended following the Examiner's remarks.

174/02403 A06

Claim 78 was rejected for using the term "aircraft system". Although applicant disagrees with the rejection, the claim was deleted.

Claim 82 was rejected for the wording of the preamble. Applicant has not the slightest idea what is wrong with the claim and why the Examiner claims that the claim does not describe a method of designing a vehicle. But in order to expedite prosecution, the preamble was shortened.

The computerized tools were qualified as designed tools and the statement "suitable for performing respective design tasks" was removed.

As to the other rejections, applicant respectfully submits that the claim should be evaluated on its whole and not word by word or statement by statement. While the word contemplating may be broad or relate to a mental act, it is not the only limitation of the claim, and the claim should be evaluated in its entirety.

Claim 84 was amended to overcome the rejection.

#### **Discussion of the prior art**

The Examiner did not perform a complete examination of the application, although MPEP 2143.03 cited by the Examiner in the office action: **"Ex parte Ionescu, 222 USPO 537 (Bd. Pat. App & Inter. 1984) (Claims on appeal were rejected on indefiniteness grounds only; the rejection was reversed and the case remanded to the Examiner for consideration of pertinent prior art.)"**, seems to imply he should have. Nonetheless, following is a short discussion of the patentability of the claims based on the prior art listed in the office action, in an attempt to further the prosecution of the application.

The prior art presented by the Examiner generates a database which collects all the data of the vehicle. While such a database may have its advantages it cannot be efficiently used as a fast communication tool between workers for various reasons, such as size, security and unnecessary information. In addition, the prior art that includes all information has not shown an appreciation of the importance for a tool that allows substantially every design worker to get an overview of the entire vehicle and avoid inter-system design problems before they occur or solve them early in the design. To the best of applicant's knowledge, the prior art at the time the present application was filed was directed at having each worker deal only with the system to which he/she is assigned without getting an overall view of the vehicle.

In the telephone conference on June 21, 2006, the Examiner suggested that the claims are mere manipulation of database information. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not the case. The set up defined by the claims is a working environment in which a plurality of workers

174/02403 A06

are provided access to a database or index and is totally different from a private system in which a person on his computer performs some data filtering of a database.

**Response to arguments**

1) The Examiner stated that the term major elements merely refers to elements that were considered major elements for the purpose of being included in the database.

In response, applicant states that unless the claims include additional limitations, that is a precise understanding. Applicant does not see any problem with this understanding. If the Examiner is of the opinion that it makes the claims broad, he is respectfully requested to present prior art which makes the claims anticipated or obvious.


2) Regarding 101 rejections, applicant responded that the Examiner's rejection by pointing out that a claim that is broad is not non-statutory. Broad claims are supposed to be rejected based on 102 or 103 and not 101. Applicant respectfully additionally points out that the 101 rejections are meant to address cases in which an applicant is attempting to monopolize a method which currently has no utility in a hope that at a later stage someone else will find a utility and the applicant will reap the revenue. This is not the case in the current application.

3) The Examiner stated that it would be obvious to leave restricted information out of an insecure database. Applicant respectfully responds that the prior art does not teach or suggest using an insecure database. On the contrary, the database of the prior art includes all the design information and must be secure. The Examiner is respectfully requested to provide prior art which suggests using a database which is not restricted in viewing as defined by the claims.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are clear, concise and patentable over the prior art. If the Examiner is not convinced that the claims are allowable, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned at 1 (877) 428-5468. Please note that this is a direct *toll free* number in the US that is answered in the undersigned's Israel office. Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shlomo SHKOLNIK

  
Maier FENSTER  
Reg. No. 41,016

August 21, 2006  
William H. Dippert, Esq.  
Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP  
250 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10177